

## THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA

To all to whom these exesents shoul come: North Carolina State Unibersity and H.S. Gobernment as represented by the Secretary of Agriculture

MOCCOUS, THERE HAS BEEN PRESENTED TO THE

## Secretary of Agriculture

AN APPLICATION REQUESTING A CERTIFICATE OF PROTECTION FOR AN ALLEGED DISTINCT VARIETY OF SEXUALLY REPRODUCED, OR TUBER PROPAGATED PLANT, THE NAME AND DESCRIPTION OF WHICH ARE CONTAINED IN THE APPLICATION AND EXHIBITS, A COPY OF WHICH IS HEREUNTO ANNEXED AND MADE A PART HEREOF, AND THE VARIOUS REQUIREMENTS OF LAW IN SUCH CASES MADE AND PROVIDED HAVE BEEN COMPLIED WITH, AND THE TITLE THERETO IS FROM THE RECORDS OF THE PLANT VARIETY PROTECTION OFFICE, IN THE APPLICANT(S) INDICATED IN THE SAID COPY, AND WHEREAS, UPON DUE EXAMINATION MADE, THE SAID APPLICANT(S) IS (ARE) ADMIDGED TO BE ENTITLED TO A CERTIFICATE OF PLANT VARIETY PROTECTION UNDER THE LAW.

NOW, THEREFORE, THIS CERTIFICATE OF PLANT VARIETY PROTECTION IS TO GRANT UNTO THE SAID APPLICANT(S) AND THE SUCCESSORS, HERS OR ASSIGNS OF THE SAID APPLICANT(S) FOR THE TERM OF TWENTY YEARS FROM THE DATE OF THIS GRANT, SUBJECT TO THE PAYMENT OF THE REQUIRED FEES AND PERIODIC SPLENISHMENT OF VIABLE BASIC SEED OF THE VARIETY IN A PUBLIC REPOSITORY AS PROVIDED BY LAW, THE HT TO EXCLUDE OTHERS FROM SELLING THE VARIETY, OR OFFERING IT FOR SALE, OR REPRODUCING IT, OR TING IT, OR EXPORTING IT, OR CONDITIONING IT FOR PROPAGATION, OR STOCKING IT FOR ANY OF THE URPOSES, OR USING IT IN PRODUCING A HYBRID OR DIFFERENT VARIETY THEREFROM, TO THE EXTENT BY THE PLANT VARIETY PROTECTION ACT. IN THE UNITED STATES SEED OF THIS VARIETY (I) SOLD BY VARIETY NAME ONLY AS A CLASS OF CERTIFIED SEED AND (2) SHALL CONFORM TO THE NUMBER ATTEMPT OF THE RIGHTS. (84 STAT. 1542, AS AMENDED, 7 U.S.C. 2321 ET SEO.)

#### **PEANUT**

### 'Phillips'

In Testimon Thereof, I have hereunto set my hand and caused the seal of the Hant Enricty Frotestion Office to be affixed at the City of Washington, D.C. this eleven day of December, in the year two thousand and six.

Commissioner

Plant Variety Protoction Office Agricultural Marketing Service Secretary of Agriculture

NAME (Please print or type)

**Assistant Administrator** 

Richard J. Brenner

CAPACITY OR TITLE

1/9/06

Wat

NAME (Please print or type)

Donna M. Cookmeyer

Office of Technology Transfer North Carolina State University

CAPACITY OR TITLE

Director

200600070

#### INSTRUCTIONS

GENERAL: To be effectively filed with the Plant Variety Protection Office (PVPO), ALL of the following items must be received in the PVPO: (1) Completed application form signed by the owner; (2) completed exhibits A, B, C, E; (3) for a seed reproduced variety at least 2,500 viable untreated seeds, for a hybrid variety at least 2,500 untreated seeds of each line necessary to reproduce the variety, or for tuber reproduced varieties verification that a viable (in the sense that it will reproduce an entire plant) tissue culture will be deposited and maintained in an approved public repository; (4) check drawn on a U.S. bank for \$3,652 (\$432 filing fee and \$3,220 examination fee), payable to "Treasurer of the United States" (See Section 97.6 of the Regulations and Rules of Practice.) Partial applications will be held in the PVPO for not more than 90 days, then returned to the applicant as unfiled. Mail application and other requirements to Plant Variety Protection Office, AMS, USDA, Room 401, NAL Building, 10301 Baltimore Avenue, Beltsville, MD 20705-2351. Retain one copy for your files. All items on the face of the application are self explanatory unless noted below. Corrections on the application form and exhibits must be initialed and dated. DO NOT use masking materials to make corrections. If a certificate is allowed, you will be requested to send a check payable to "Treasurer of the United States" in the amount of \$432 for issuance of the certificate. Certificates will be issued to owner, not licensee or agent.

Plant Variety Protection Office Telephone: (301) 504-5518 FAX: (301) 504-5291

Homepage: http://www.ams.usda.gov/science/pvpo/pvpindex.htm

To avoid conflict with other variety names in use, the applicant must check the appropriate recognized authority and provide evidence that name has been cleared by the appropriate recognized authority before the Certificate of Protection is issued. For example, for agricultural and vegetable crops, contact: Seed Branch, AMS, USDA, 10301 Baltimore Avenue, Suite 401 NAL Building, Beltsville, MD 20705. Telephone: (301) 504-5682 http://www.ams.usda.gov/lsg/seed.htm.

#### ITEM

- 19a. Give: (1) the genealogy, including public and commercial varieties, lines, or clones used, and the breeding method;
  - (2) the details of subsequent stages of selection and multiplication;
  - (3) evidence of uniformity and stability; and
  - (4) the type and frequency of variants during reproduction and multiplication and state how these variants may be identified
- 19b. Give a summary of the variety's distinctness. Clearly state how this application variety may be distinguished from all other varieties in the same crop. If the new variety is most similar to one variety or a group of related varieties:
  - (1) identify these varieties and state all differences objectively;
  - (2) attach statistical data for characters expressed numerically and demonstrate that these are clear differences; and
  - (3) submit, if helpful, seed and plant specimens or photographs (prints) of seed and plant comparisons which clearly indicate distinctness.
- 19c. Exhibit C forms are available from the PVPO Office for most crops; specify crop kind. Fill in Exhibit C (Objective Description of Variety) form as completely as possible to describe your variety.
- 19d. Optional additional characteristics and/or photographs. Describe any additional characteristics that cannot be accurately conveyed in Exhibit C.

  Use comparative varieties as is necessary to reveal more accurately the characteristics that are difficult to describe, such as plant habit, plant color, disease resistance, etc.
- 19e. Section 52(5) of the Act requires applicants to furnish a statement of the basis of the applicant's ownership. An Exhibit E form is available from the PVPO.
- 20. If "Yes" is specified (seed of this variety be sold by variety name only, as a class of certified seed), the applicant MAY NOT reverse this affirmative decision after the variety has been sold and so labeled, the decision published, or the certificate issued. However, if "No" has been specified, the applicant may change the choice. (See Regulations and Rules of Practice, Section 97.103).
- 23. See Sections 41, 42, and 43 of the Act and Section 97.5 of the regulations for eligibility requirements.
- 24. See Section 55 of the Act for instructions on claiming the benefit of an earlier filing date.
- 22. CONTINUED FROM FRONT (Please provide a statement as to the limitation and sequence of generations that may be certified.)

Seed of Phillips peanut shall be limited to the Foundation, Registered, and Certified generations.

23. CONTINUED FROM FRONT (Please provide the date of first sale, disposition, transfer, or use for each country and the circumstances, if the variety (including any harvested material) or a hybrid produced from this variety has been sold, disposed of, transferred, or used in the U.S. or other countries.)

Foundation seed of Phillips was first sold on March 31, 2005.

24. CONTINUED FROM FRONT (Please give the country, date of filing or issuance, and assigned reference number, if the variety or any component of the variety is protected by intellectual property right (Plant Breeder's Right or Patent).)

NOTES: It is the responsibility of the applicant/owner to keep the PVPO informed of any changes of address or change of ownership or assignment or owner's representative during the life of the application/certificate. The fees for filing a change of address; owner's representative; ownership or assignment; or any modification of owner's name is specified in Section 97.175 of the regulations. (See Section 101 of the Act, and Sections 97.130, 97.131, 97.175(h) of the Regulations and Rules of Practice.)

According to the Paperwork Reduction Act of 1995, an agency may not conduct or sponsor, and a person is not required to respond to a collection of information unless it displays a valid OMB control number. The valid OMB control number for this information collection is 0581-0055. The time required to complete this information collection is 0581-0055. The time required to complete this information collection is 0581-0055. The time required to complete this information collection is 0581-0055. The time required to complete this information collection of information collection of information.

The U.S. Department of Agriculture (USDA) prohibits discrimination in all its programs and activities on the basis of race, color, national origin, gender, religion, age, disability, sexual orientation, marital or family status, political beliefs, parental status, or protected genetic information. (Not all prohibited bases apply to all programs.) Persons with disabilities who require alternative means for communication of program information (Brailia, large print, audiotape, etc.) should contact USDA's TARGET Center at 202-720-2800 (voice and TDD).

To file a complaint of discrimination, write USDA, Director, Office of Civil Rights, Room 326-W, Whitten Building, 14th and Independence Avenue, SW, Washington, DC 20250-9410 or cat 202-720-5964 (voice and TDD). USDA is an equal opportunity provider and employer

2

# Exhibit A Origin and Breeding History of the Variety

'Phillips', tested under the experimental designation N98003, is an F<sub>6</sub>-derived line selected from cross X92165 made in 1989 between two early maturing NCSU breeding lines, N90014E (used as the female) and N91024 (used as the male). Both parents were F<sub>5</sub>-derived selections from a cross between 'NC 7' (Wynne et al., 1979) and 'NC 9' (Wynne et al., 1986). The breeding method used in development of Phillips was a combination of single-seed descent and pedigree selection. F<sub>1</sub> plants of cross X92165 were grown at a winter nursery in Puerto Rico in the winter of 1992-93; single-seed descent was practiced in the F<sub>2</sub> in North Carolina in the summer of 1993 and in the F<sub>3</sub> at the 1993-1994 winter nursery in Puerto Rico; the F<sub>1:4</sub> family was subjected to selection for pod size and shape in the field in North Carolina in 1994; as were F<sub>4:5</sub> families in 1995 and F<sub>5:6</sub> families 1996. Selection in the F<sub>4</sub>, F<sub>5</sub>, and F<sub>6</sub> generations was based on visual evaluation of pod size, shape, and brightness. Subsequent selection among F<sub>6</sub>-derived families was based on yield, grade factors, and pod brightness and hue. Yield and grade data were collected on the F<sub>6.7</sub> family 1997 Preliminary Yield Test (single-rep tests conducted at two sites) in 1997, and the  $F_{6:8}$  family was numbered in 1998 upon its entry into advanced yield trials. N98003 was entered in the NCSU Advanced Yield Test (two-rep tests conducted at three sites annually) from 1998 through 2003, the VPI-NCSU Peanut Variety and Quality Evaluation Program (conducted at four sites annually with separate two-rep tests dug early and late at each site) from 2000 through 2003, and the Uniform Peanut Performance Test (conducted at nine sites across seven states) in 2003. Phillips was developed by employees of NCSU (breeder Thomas G. Isleib; agricultural research specialists Philip W. Rice and Susan C. Copeland, research technicians Roy W. Mozingo II and John B. Graeber) and by employees of USDA-ARS (research chemist Harold E. Pattee and supervisory plant physiologist Timothy H. Sanders).

### Statement of Uniformity and Stability

Phillips was observed over seven (7) generations and was found to be uniform and stable. No variants were observed in Phillips.

#### References

Wynne, J.C., R.W. Mozingo, and D.A. Emery. 1979. Registration of NC 7 peanut (Reg. No. 22). Crop Sci. 19:563.

Wynne, J.C., R.W. Mozingo, and D.A. Emery. 1986. Registration of 'NC 9' peanut. Crop Sci. 26:197.

# Exhibit B Statement of Distinctness

The large-seeded virginia-type cultivar to which Phillips is most similar is NC-V 11. The simplest character that clearly distinguishes Phillips from NC-V 11 is seed coat color: Phillips has tan testa while NC-V 11 has pink testa. The two differ in several other quantitative characters of interest to producers and processors of large-seeded virginia-type peanuts, but these differences are statistically significant only when means are computed across several years and/or locations, not in each trial (see Tables 1-3 below).

Form Approved OMB NO 0581-0055

REPRODUCE LOCALLY. Include form number and date on all reproductions.

20.

According to the Paperwork Reduction Act of 1995, an agency may not conduct or sponsor, and a person is not required to respond to a collection of information unless it displays a valid OMB control number. The valid OMB control number for this information collection is 0581-0055. The time required to complete this information collection is estimated to average 1.4 hours per response, including the time for reviewing instructions, searching existing data sources, gathering and maintaining the data needed, and completing and reviewing the collection of information.

The U.S. Department of Agriculture (USDA) prohibits discrimination in all its programs and activities on the basis of race, color, national origin, gender, religion, age, disability, sexual orientation, marital or amily status, political beliefs, parental status, or protected genetic information. (Not all prohibited bases apply to all programs.) Persons with disabilities who require alternative means for communication of program information(Braille, large print, audictape, etc.) should contact USDA's TARGET Center at 202-720-2600 (voice and TDD).

To file a complaint of discrimination, write USDA, Director, Office of Civil Rights, Room 326-W, Whitten Building, 14th and Independence Avenue, SW, Washington, DC 20250-9410 or call 202-720-5964 (voice and TDD). USDA is an equal opportunity provider and employer.

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE Exhibit C
AGRICULTURAL MARKETING SERVICE
SCIENCE AND TECHNOLOGY
PLANT VARIETY PROTECTION OFFICE
BELTSVILLE, MD 20705

OBJECTIVE DESCRIPTION OF VARIETY

F	anut (Aracilis liypogaea)	
NAME OF APPLICANT (S)	TEMPORARY OR EXPERIMENTAL DESIGNATION	VARIETY NAME
North Carolina State University	N98003	Phillips
U.S. Government as represented by the Secretary of Agriculture		
ADDRESS (Street and No. or RD No., City, State, Zip Code, and Country)		FOR OFFICIAL USE ONLY
North Carolina Agricultural Research Service Campus Box 7643 North Carolina State University Raleigh, NC 27695-7643 USA		200600070
PLEASE READ ALL INSTRUCTIONS CAREFULLY:		
Place the appropriate number that describes the varietal charges, 0 8 9 or 0 9) when a number is either 99 or less	aracter of this variety in the boxes below. Ples or 9 or less.	ace a zero in the first box
Branching Pattern: 1 = Alternate – Pairs of vege 2 = Sequential – Continuous	Absent 2 = Present tative and reproductive branches (Virginia) reproductive branches (Valencia-Spanish)	·
2. PLANT:  1 = Prostrate (Florunner) 2 = Decum  2 Habit: 2 = Semi-Erect (Florispan) 4 = Erect (Florispan)	3 Branching:	1 = Sparse (Valencia) 2 = Moderate (Starr) 3 = Profuse (Florunner)
Number of Days Later Than	2 = Southeast United States 3  1 = Starr 2 = Florunner  4 = Virginia 61R  5 = NC-5 7 = Southeastern Runn  8 = Other (Specify) NC 7	= Southwest United States 4 = Other  3 = Florigiant 5 = NC-2 er 56-15
4. LEAVES:  2 Color at 60 Days (Nickerson Color Designation of the Youn 2.4 Leaflet Length/Width Ratio	gest Fully Opened Leaf) 2=	Light Green (10gy 6/9) Medium Green (2.5G 5/9) Dark green (5G 4/7) Other (Specify)

	ge for 20 pods at n mm Length	naturity):		1	5 mm	Diameter			
5 1 0		od Yield		<u> </u>					
HUU	ss Than					3 = Florigiant			
	ore Than	8	6=1	Virginia 6 NC-5 7 = Other (Sp	Southeas	stern Runner 56-	15		
=-	% Fancy Size: (%	riding 13.46 mm.,							
2 Num	ber of Seeds per F	Pod: 1	= 1 2	! = 2	3	=3 4	=3-4 5	5 = 2-3-4	
2 Cons	striction: 1 = Shallo	w or None (Virgir	ia 56R, Argentine	) 2 = Med	lium (Virg	jinia 61R) 3 = De	ep (Starr)		
1 Surfa	ace: 1 = Glabrous	(Florunner) 2 = Po	ubescent (Florispa	ın)					
2 Beak	:: 1 = Absent 2 = Ir	nconspicuous 3 =	Pronounced				·		
6. SEED (Matu	re, cured but not a	ged):			-				
03 0	act Color: 6	= White (Pearl) i = Red 0 = Other (Specif	2 = Cream 7 = Purple 9)		an (Starı Dark Purp			(Florigiant)	
1 c	oat Surface: 1	= Smooth	2 = Undented		1 1=	Uniform Color	2 = Blemis	shed	
5 s		= Spheroidal (Sta		Short Bro	ad (Floru	,	s = Elongated-Slen		r)
		= Cylindrical-tape		-			= Other (Specify)		
1 6 r	nm Length 1	0 mm Width	1 <u>8 4</u> Gr	ams per 1	00 Seed	s (8% Moisture)			
7. DISEASE RE	SISTANCE: (0 =	Not Tested. 1 = S	usceptible. 2 = Mo	oderately	Suscepti	ble. 3 = Moderate	ely Resistant, 4 = F	Resistant)	
	nern Stem Rot	0 Rust			Early Lea		Virus X	<b>,</b>	
<b>=</b>	nern Leaf Spot	0 Mosa	ic	=	od Rot C	`	Other (Specify)	CBR. Sclerotinia b	light, TSWV
				٠ تــــ					
8. INSECT RES	SISTANCE: (0 = N	ot Tested, 1 = Sus	sceptible, 2 = Mod	lerately S	usceptibl	e, 3 = Moderately	/ Resistant, 4 = Re	esistant)	
1 Thrip	s	0 Burro	wing Bug	0 L	eaf Hopp	er 0	Nematode (Spec	ify species)	
1 South	nern Corn Rootwo	rm 0 Lesse	er Cornstalk Borer	0 A	Aphid		Other (Specify) _		
9. COMPARISO	N OF SUBMITTE	D VARIETY WIT	H ONE OR MORE OLEIC: *	SIMILA	R VARIE	TIES:	· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·	F	MAIN STEM
	(% at 0%	PROTEIN*	LINOLEIC	IOD		SHELLING	SMK**	ELK+	HEIGHT
VARIETY Submitted	moisture) 52.2	(%)	ACID RATIO		IBER 3.5	(%)	(%)	(%)	(CM)
		<del></del>		-		73.3	68.2	45.3	35.6
Similar Name of	51.2		1.40	<u> </u>	9.3	72.4	66.7	32.8	30.5
Similar Variety	NC-V 11	<b></b>	NC-V 11	NC-	V 11	NC-V 11	NC-V 11	NC-V 11	NC-V 11
* From Sound M	lature Kernels ** S	ound Mature Ker	nels + Extra Large	e Kernels					
40 INDIOATE 4	VADIET/ WILLO								
	VARIETY WHIC RACTER	H MOST CLOSE	VARIETY	IHAI SU	BMILLE	D: CHARACTE	R	VARI	ETY
Pod Color			NC 10C		Hull Th	ickness		-	•
Seedling Vigor					Seed S	ize		NC	9
Seed Dormancy	1- <b>T</b>				Leaf Co	olor			-
11. COMMENTS	: (Additional desc	ription or clarifica	tion – such as: rel	ative dise	ase reac	tions may be con	npared with standa	ard varieties)	
VARIETY	STEARIC ACID (%)	BEHENIC ACID (%)	LIGNOCERIC ACID (%)						

2.9

2.6

NC-V 11

1.5

1.5

NC-V 11

2.5

2.4

NC-V 11

Submitted

Name of Similar Variety

Similar

# Exhibit D Optional Supporting Information

'Phillips' is a virginia-type peanut (*Arachis hypogaea* L.) line with a high yield of bright fancy pods. It has alternate branching pattern, intermediate runner growth habit, medium green foliage, large seeds with tan testa averaging 835 mg seed<sup>-1</sup>, approximately 34% jumbo pods and 45% fancy pods.

Agronomic performance and grade. Yield of Phillips is comparable to that of existing cultivars. In the NCSU Advanced Yield Tests (Table 1), yield and value per acre of Phillips were numerically less but not significantly different from Gregory, the best entry in the test. In comparison with NC-V 11 (Wynne et al., 1991), and VA 98R (Mozingo et al., 2000), the cultivars closest to Phillips in distribution of jumbo and fancy pods, Phillips was numerically but not significantly higher yielding than NC-V 11 (3739 vs. 3614 lb A<sup>-1</sup>, ns) and higher than VA 98R (3739 vs. 3164 lb A<sup>-1</sup>, P<0.05), with corresponding differences in value per acre at 2003 support price levels (690 vs. 649 \$ A<sup>-1</sup>, ns; and 690 vs. 567 \$ A<sup>-1</sup>, P<0.05, respectively). In the PVQE trials from 2000 through 2003 (Table 2), Phillips's yield per acre was not significantly greater than those of NC-V 11, Gregory, VA 98R, or Wilson (4617 vs. 4531, 4548, 4499, or 4694 lb A<sup>-1</sup>, respectively, all ns), but its value was (826 vs. 787, 792, 784, or 795 \$ A<sup>-1</sup>, all P<0.05). The difference between the results obtained by the NCSU breeding project and the PVQE program may reflect the use of irrigation at all NCDA research stations used as test locations by the NCSU project, the sparse seeding rate used in the NCSU trials, or the differential occurrence and severity of diseases at test sites.

In terms of grade, Phillips compares most directly with smaller-podded virginia-type cultivars NC-V 11, VA 98R, and Wilson. Jumbo pod content of Phillips was greater than that of all three comparable cultivars while its fancy pod content was similar. In the PVQE trials, jumbo pods of Phillips were brighter than those of NC-V 11 and VA 98R (46.8 vs. 45.3 or 45.5 Hunter L score, both P<0.05) but not different from jumbo pods of Wilson. Fancy pods of Phillips were brighter than those of NC-V 11 (46.0 vs. 45.3 Hunter L score, P<0.05) but not different from those of VA 98R and Wilson. Phillips had higher content of extra large kernels and sound mature kernels than any of the three comparable cultivars; consequently its price per pound was also higher.

From 1998 through 2003 the old industry standard cultivar Florigiant (1) was used as a check in the NCSU Advanced Yield Test, permitting a comparison between its pod characteristics and those of Phillips (Table 1). Phillips had significantly fewer jumbo pods than Florigiant (38 vs 45%, P<0.05) but the fancy pod contents of the two lines were not different. Jumbo pod brightness of the two lines did not differ, but fancy brightness scores for Phillips were higher than those for Florigiant (47.2 vs. 45.7 Hunter L score, P<0.05). In spite of having fewer jumbo pods than Florigiant, Phillips had significantly more extra large kernels (44 vs. 28%, P<0.05). It also had higher sound mature kernel and meat content than Florigiant (71 vs. 67%, P<0.05; and 73 vs. 70%, P<0.05).

**Disease reactions.** Phillips was selected from the conventional cultivar development stream in the NCSU peanut breeding project, *i.e.*, it was not developed specifically to carry any particular disease resistance. Testing of Phillips's reactions to diseases prevalent in the Virginia-Carolina production area began in 1999.

Resistance to early leafspot. Phillips's reaction to early leafspot was evaluated from 1999 through 2003 in five field trials at the Peanut Belt Research Station with no application of

leafspot fungicide during the entire season (Table 3). Defoliation was rated on a proportional scale of 1 (no defoliation) to 9 (complete defoliation) in late September or early October each year. Yield was measured on the unsprayed plots. Phillips was not significantly different in defoliation from the best two cultivars, NC 12C and Perry, or from Wilson (6.6 vs. 6.2, 6.3, and 6.7 respectively, all ns), but it had a lower score than VA 98R (6.6 vs. 7.5, P<0.05). Yield of Phillips in the absence of chemical control was not significantly different from that of NC 12C, the best line (2608 vs. 3013 lb A<sup>-1</sup>, ns), nor was it significantly different from the worst line in the test.

Resistance to Cylindrocladium black rot and Sclerotinia blight. Although Phillips was entered in disease trials on infested soil from 1999 through 2003, the trials were so affected by tomato spotted wilt virus in 2000, 2001, and 2002 that useful data was acquired in only two tests for either soil-borne disease. Reactions to both diseases are expressed as the proportion of plants exhibiting symptoms in plots grown on infested soil (Table 3). CBR incidence in Phillips was less than that in VA 98R or Wilson (18 vs. 48 and 49%, respectively, both P<0.05) and not significantly different from that in NC 10C, NC 12C, or Perry. Phillips is susceptible to Sclerotinia blight with more than 51% of plants exhibiting symptoms compared with 36% for Perry (ns) and 32% for VA 98R (ns), two cultivars with partial resistance.

Field resistance to tomato spotted wilt virus. Phillips's reaction to tomato spotted wilt virus was evaluated from 1999 through 2003 in field trials at the Peanut Belt Research Station in plots planted at 50 cm seed spacing (Table 3). The thin seeding rate and withholding of insecticide from the plots promoted feeding by thrips, the vector of TSWV. Disease reaction to TSWV was measured as the proportion of plants exhibiting foliar symptoms at any time during the season. TSWV incidence in Phillips was greater than but not significantly different from that in NC-V 11, either across all tests (38 vs. 30%, ns) or in 2000-2003 (60 vs. 50%, ns). TSWV incidence in Phillips was greater than that in Gregory (38 vs. 25%, P<0.05 and 60 vs. 45%, P<0.05).

Blanching characteristics. In the PVQE trials, blanching of extra large kernels of Phillips was slightly inferior to that of NC-V 11, VA 98R, and Wilson (Table 4). Phillips was similar to the three comparable cultivars in percentage of kernels split in blanching and in kernels partially blanched, but it had fewer whole blanched kernels than NC-V 11 and VA 98R (85.4 vs. 89.2 and 88.8%, respectively, both P<0.05), and more kernels not blanched than any of the three (2.8 vs. 1.6, 1.4, and 1.3%, respectively, all P<0.05). The behavior of medium kernels of Phillips under blanching was similar: it produced as many split kernels as NC-V 11, VA 98R, and Wilson, but it produced fewer whole blanched kernels (71.7 vs. 81.6, 82.3, and 77.7%, respectively, all P<0.05), more medium kernels not blanched (11.1 vs. 4.9, 4.3, and 6.5%, respectively, all P<0.05), and more partially blanched medium kernels than NC-V 11 and VA 98R (11.3 vs. 7.2 and 6.8%, respectively, both P<0.05). However, blanching of Phillips was not different from that of NC 7 in most respects.

Flavor characteristics. Flavor of Phillips was evaluated by a trained sensory panel in the Department of Food Science at N.C. State University under the direction of Dr. Harold Pattee, USDA-ARS Market Quality and Handling Research Unit. Samples of sound mature kernels from three locations from the 2002 growing season were submitted for evaluation along with samples of check cultivars. The roasted peanut, sweet, and bitter attributes of flavor in Phillips were not significantly different from those in NC 7, the flavor standard for the virginia market-type (Table 6). Phillips had lower intensity of the roasted peanut attribute (3.35 vs. 4.19,

P<0.05) compared with Gregory. Flavor was also evaluated as part of the cooperative Uniform Peanut Performance conducted at nine locations in 2003. Sensory analysis was performed on an ELK sample from each location by a sensory panel conducted by Timothy H. Sanders and Keith Hendrix of the USDA-ARS Market Quality and Handling Research Unit at Raleigh, NC. Again, flavor of Phillips did not differ from that of NC 7 for any sensory attribute measured, although it was lower in the intensity of the sweet attribute (2.08 vs. 2.29 flavor intensity units [fiu], P<0.05) and higher in bitter (3.06 vs. 2.91 fiu, P<0.05) compared with the runner-type flavor standard, Florunner.

Oil chemistry and calcium content. Phillips has normal oil chemistry. Compared with NC-V 11, it has lower palmitic acid content (9.7 vs. 10.4% of total fatty acids, P<0.05), higher oleic acid content (48.8 vs. 47.6%, P<0.05), lower linoleic acid content (32.0 vs. 33.1%, P<0.05), higher arachidic acid content (1.3 vs. 1.2%, P<0.05), higher eicosenoic acid content (1.3 vs. 1.2%, P<0.05), lower ratio of polyunsaturated to saturated fatty acids (1.79 vs. 1.85, P<0.05), and higher long-chain saturated fatty acids (5.7 vs. 5.3%, P<0.05). It was not significantly different from NC-V 11 for stearic, behenic, lignoceric, or total saturated fatty acid content, nor for oleic-to-linoleic acid ratio.

Phillips was developed by employees of NCSU (breeder Thomas G. Isleib; agricultural research specialists Philip W. Rice and Susan C. Copeland, research technicians Roy W. Mozingo II and John B. Graeber) and by employees of USDA-ARS (research chemist Harold E. Pattee and supervisory plant physiologist Timothy H. Sanders).

### References

Carver, W.A. 1969. Registration of Florigiant peanuts (Reg. No. 1). Crop Sci. 9: 849-850. Mozingo, R.W., T.A. Coffelt, and T.G. Isleib. 2000. Registration of 'VA 98R' peanut. Crop Sci. 40: 1202-1203.

Wynne, J.C., T.A. Coffelt, R.W. Mozingo, and W.F. Anderson. 1991b. Registration of 'NC-V11' peanut. Crop Sci. 31: 484-485.

										_		:	l
		5	uoo 1	101	20 %		<u> </u>					00 01	1
		toje.	notter	SCO!C	1=10000	0=nounleto	adinos.					ELL OT	
		ì	Crop tation con-	value	8//8		•	22	000	5	675	23 A 23	5
			Fod		11/4			55	200	2022	3627	#47.7BB	3
		,	arice Trice	Purse.	47/7	l L		22	10.01	17.61	18.67	** 55 171	
		•	Magt	INTER	%	!		77	400	0.4	71.2	, y	,
			OK	4	%		;	77	20	7 1	2.0	<u>a</u>	
			S		%							+0.1m	
			SMK		%							+14	
			EI.K		%			7.7	436		53.4	-10.4	
		40.00	ELK		%							+6.8"	
	eioht		seeds	ŀ	00	ji						+2.138	İ
-oqun	-		ratio	1								+0.10"	- €
Ju		Vellow. fa		ı	nter	ą						10,6" +0	8
	spo		ness ne			8						•	ڇَ
	ancy pods	Pripht. Re			Hunter Hun	.,				45.2 .2		10.04	ls of pr
	H-4	"		;	Ни	_	,	4	4	**	ř	·	1% leve
		N-	ten	3	*		ć		<del>2</del>			, O	%, and
	ls	Yellor	ness ness tent	7.7	Hunte	L a b	ç			146		-0.	10%, 59
	мро рос	- Red-	ness	17	r nunte	a	ç					-0.5	t at the
	Ju	Brigh	ness	7.7	อนาน					45.0			gnifican
		Ç	tent				22	1	36.0	34 5		+	rit or sig
Farmer stock	/ pods	Con- Bright- (	ness	II. market	numer -	-1	22	;	46.6	453	,	+	ignifica
Farme	tancy	Con-	tent	70	0		22					7.1+	ere not s
-	√eight	×f 100		b.	<b>×</b> 0		21 21 22	;	741	227	10 5	C.C.	s that w
,	-	J	LSK	8			7		8	8.0	o offs	200	ference
			FM	%	?		21	t	3	8.0	A 1 DB	٠. <u>۲</u>	note dif
							Trials	D. 112	rumps	NC-V 11	Difference	DITION OF THE	ns, †, *, * Denote differences that were not significant or significant at the 10%, 5%, and

and Quality Evaluation trials conducted at TAREC (Suffolk, VA), Jack Pond farm (Sedley, Southampton Co., VA), Billy Fisher farm (Pendleton, Northampton Co., NC), Taylor Slade farm (Williamston, Martin Co., NC), Pearnt Belt Research Station (Lewiston, Bertie Co., NC), and Border Belt Tobacco Research Station (Whiteville, Columbus Co., NC). Comparison of agronomic performance and grade factors of NCSU release Phillips with those of NC-V 11. Data from 2000-2004 Peanut Variety Table 2.

		Š	value	\$/4	4	848	808	+36	
		Pod	yield	15/4	6	4548	4470	+78ns	
		Support	price	<i>4/1</i> 9	40	18.46	17.93	+0.53	
		_	Meat	%	9	73.7	72.8	6.0+	5
			DK	%	9	1.1	11	+0.04	nectively
			OK	%	9	1.7	2.2	-0.5	ility, res
			SS	%	9	2.5	2.2	+0.3	
			SMK	%	8	9.89	67.4	+1.1	levels o
			ELK	%	40	46.6	33.5	+13.1	and 1%
Jumbo-			ratio		40	0.81	0.58	+0.23	t at the 10%, 5%, and 1% levels of
	spod /	Bright-	tent ness	Hunter L	40	45.8	44.9	6.0+	at the 10
				%	40	45.5	46.7	-1.2 <sup>m</sup>	ifican
	spod o	Bright-	tent ness	Hunter L	40	46.5	45.1	+1.5	int or sign
		_		%	40	34.1	26.3	+7.8	significa
Farmer stock	, pods	Bright-	ness	Hunter L		46.1		٠,	were not significar
Farme	fancy	Con	tent	%	40	62	52	+6.5	nces that v
			LSK	%	40	Ξ:	1.1	$0.3 + 0.0^{m}$	ffere
			FM	%	8	1,0		'	enote di
					Trials	Phillips	NC-V 11	Difference	ns,†,*,** Denote di

Comparison of blanching and composition traits of NCSU release Phillips with those of NC-V 11. Data from 2000-2004 Peanut Variety and Quality Evaluation trials conducted at TAREC (Suffolk, VA), Jack Pond farm (Sedley, Southampton Co., VA), Billy Fisher farm (Pendleton, Northampton Co., NC), Taylor Slade farm (Williamston, Martin Co., NC), Peanut Belt Research Station (Lewiston, Bertie Co., NC), and Border Belt Tobacco Research Station (Whiteville, Columbus Co., NC). Table 3.

			÷42	34.21	45	#	g)\$	, di	, s
		Calcium	content	mdd	70	787	761	+26ns	
	Tono-	chain	sats	%					
		S/d	ratio		18	1.64	1.69	-0.05	
	Total	satu-	rates	%	18	18.4	18.5	-0.1	
		0/1/	ratio		18	1.74	1.64	+0.10	
(1)			value	l				•	
Fatty acid profile	eno-	eric	6.0	%	18	9.1	ζ.	J.0™	
Fatty ac	ehen-Li	9	(22:0) (24:0)	%	18	3.1	2.7	±	
	Fico- B	enoic	(20:0) (20:1) (22:0) (2	%	18	1,4	1,3	+0.1	
	Arach-	idics	(20:0)	%	18	4,	1.3	+0.1	
	Lino- 4	leic	(18:2)	%	18	29.9	30.9	-1.0	
			(18:1)		18	50,3	49.3	+1,1,	
		tearic		%				+0.1	
	alm-	itic S	16:0) (	%	81	9.6	10.3	0.7	respect
	_		Partial (	%	10	10.2	6.9	+3,315	ability,
		ching	Not	%	10	7.4	2.5	+4.9"	of prob
	sels	Blan	Whole Not Partial (	%	10	75.2	83.4	-8.2	6 levels
	Medium kernels		Split	%				+0.2115	, and 19
	Medi	ire	Loss	%	10	2.9	3.0	-0.1m	%, 5%
Blanching characteristics		Moisture	After	%	10	3.8	3.8	+1.91 -0.012 +0.012 -0.1115	t the 10
charac			Before	%	10	5.1	5.1	-0.0	ificant 8
anchin		pei	Partia	%	10	7.1	5.2	+1.9	or sign
M		Kernels blanched	e Not	%	10	1.9	0.8	+1.1	ificant
	Extra large kernels	Kernels	t Who	%	10	85.8	88.8	" -3.0°"	not sign
	a large		s Spli	%	10	2.7	2.9	ns -0.2"	it were
	Ext	ure	er Los	% %		2.6	2,4	l <sup>ra</sup> +0.2	nces the
		Moisture	Before After Loss Split Whole Not Partial Before After Loss	%	0 10	0 3.9	5.0 3.9	$)^{n3} + 0.1^{n9} + 0.2^{n8} - 0.2$	differe
			Beft	%	10	5.(	5.6	-0.0	Denote
					Trials	Phillips	2V 11	Difference	is,†,*,** Denote differences that were not significant or significant at the 10%, 5%, and 1% levels of probability, respectively
			ı		Ξ	료	Ž	리 ?	

Table 1. Mean performance in 1998-2003 NCSU Advanced Yield Test conducted at three locations (Peanut Belt Research Station at Lewiston, Upper Coastal Plains Research Station at Rocky Mount, and Border Belt Tobacco Research Station at Whiteville) over six years.

		ue -	¥		~	•	le?	. ~	; ∝				۲.						_			
	;	Crop Value	ue rank	2												1				×	'n	
										1						{						
		pod 1	ı																tors!			
	5	Support	bucc	q(/ð	18.53	18.56	18.52	$17.28^{2}$	18.45	377.77.5	17.73	16.95	18.01	18.50	18.58ª	18.06	10.31	10.01	al s	18.12	53	0.35
	7	Meat		\$	74.0	73.2	73.3	69.52	72.5	1 16	71.1	5.69	71.8	72.73	72.7	717	5	2 6	14.1	1.7/	2,7	1.3
	Š	Cuner	or The Co	R	5.5	$1.9^{2}$	1.9	$2.6^{a}$	1.62	7.6	, č	8.7	2.0	1.72	1.62	2.1		,	3	7.7	25.1	0.4
	Comme	sound solite	è	R						1						1			1			9.0
	Sound			, ,	71.4	70.9	70.8	66.72	70.43	2 8 5	200	00.0	4.69	70.6	70.8	69.3	70 4ª	707	•			
	Extra																					
	Weight	_	ı													ļ			ı			
	to- W															Į			1 30			
Ju	llow- f	ness	Hunter h																147		4.1	4.0
	sd-Ye	I SS	Hunter o H			_													3.3			
	Bright- Red-	ss ne	er L. Hun																			
ŗ	Brie	ne	Hunter L												ı				440			
	ő	tent	%	¥ 07	2.5	4.0	D.0.0	6.04	28.1	37.8	41.0		Ì	C.7C	7.7.7	32.5	41.9	41.5	37.8	7 7	14.1	3.6
	Yellow-	ness	Hunter b	1503	7	20.01	14.0 10.1	15,0	15.0	15,1ª	15.18	14 782	16.03	C,C1	77.01	$15,1^{8}$	$14.5^{2}$	14.3	149	7	) () ()	9,0
100	Con- Bright- Red- 1	ness	Hunter a	3 4 lb											- 1				3.3			
Jump	right-	ness	Hunter L. Hunter a	45 QB	14 03	25.0	10.4 10.4 10.4	7,7	45.8	46.7	45.73	745.12	77 £3	֓֞֝֓֓֓֓֓֓֓֓֓֓֓֓֓֓֓֓֓֓֓֓֓֓֓֓֓֓֓֓֓֓֓֓֓֓֓	40.3	45.0²	$43.8^{z}$	44.0 <sup>2</sup>	45.5		- ·	1.6
	Sur. E	tent	% F						. !						- 4				ŀ			1
			•						- 1						- 1							•
Farmer stock	-uo	tent	¥ %	79.4	2		7.70	± ₹	2/,0	\$6.3	31.6	8.67	34.5	2 5	2.2	£7.9	6.8	43	3.0	4	r v	9.°
	of 100								- 1						- }							1
	thelled or																					
For- eign L	<b>6</b> 1	~							- i						1							-1
ri-toʻ	Ħ	ਹ		-	پ	_		<i>.</i> C		٠	J	***	_	· ¢	1	، د	ب	7	0	43	! \$	أ
		Entry		N97138C	N98002	Phillins	Morioiant	NC 7	202	ار د د د	NC 10C	NC-V 11	NC 12C	Greenry	D	reny	VA-C 92K	VA 98R	Mean	CV (%)	I SD.	20,70

a,z Denote means not significantly different from the greatest and the least in the column, respectively, by protected t-test at the 5% level of probability.

Denotes traits for which the F-test of differences among entries was not significant at the 5% level of probability.

Table 2. Mean performance in the 2000-2003 Peanut Variety and Quality Evaluation trials, four years at four locations with separate tests dug early and late at each site.

			Farmer	stock																			
			fancy pods	pods	Jumbe	Jumbo pods	Fanc	spod A	Jumbo-									Pod vield	, de		enfert aca	outer	
			Con	Bright-	Con	Bright	Çoù	Bright-	to-fancy							upport	Across	Farly	1 ate	Differ. Across	1.	Tota Diffe	100
Identity	FM	LS	tent	ness	tent	ness	tent	tent ness	ratio	ELK	SMK	SS	OK	DK	content	price	diggings	digging	a			70	ence
	%	%	%	Hunter T	%	Hunter L	%	Hunter L		%	z	%	%	%		e/lb	1b/A Rank	ib/A Ronk	١.	1	1 Poul 4/3 4 Poul 7/8		
N97138C	1.2	1.3	77.4	44.9	36.3	45.5	41.4	44.5	0.88	37.0	68.6	2.9		4	75 O <sup>8</sup>	17 86ª	4410 9	a	4504 7 +1	C	0 770 0		
N98002	0.1	1.0	78.9	46.7	32.1	47.0ª	47.0	46.5	89'0	45.2	68.0	2.4		26.0	73.2	17.85	46308 2	٠,	4730 7 +1	06/18 0074		813 950	n h
Phillips	1.0	1.0	78.8	46.4	33.8	46.8	45.3	46.0	0.75	45.3	68.2	2.5		1.0	73.3	17.90°	46173	3 <b>V</b>	47.40 4 + 1.5	40 07 V		7 020	Į •
VT 9506102-6	1.1	1.5	81.0	47.0	32.6	$47.2^{a}$	48.7ª	46.83	29'0	37.5	68.8g	$1.7^{2}$		26.0	73.5	17.94	4528 6	ر د	2427 10 -2	01178 8078		707	104 21E
NC 7	1.3	2.4	86.5	43.52	58.1	44,02	28.6	42.52	2.03	46.6	699	23	1	1.68	72.3	17.58	4270 <sup>2</sup> 11	·   <u>-</u>	4361 11 ±1	OATS 7452 1		- 1 '	7
NC-V 11	1.2	1.1	72.5	45.3	26.12	45.3	46.6	45.3	0.56	32.8	66.7	2.2		1	72.4	17.34	4531 5	7	15 11 10CH	107 707		101	1.C.+
NC 12C	1.5	$3.0^{a}$	81.8	44.3	49.8	44.8	32.3	43.5	1.54	45.0	97.9	2.4		- S	73.2	17.74	4160 <sup>2</sup> 12	2	4228 12 ±1	2718 70621			·
Gregory	1.4	2.0	90.2ª	44.3	68.4	44.7	$22.0^{2}$	42.92	3.11	48.3	9,99	$1.6^{2}$		1.7	71.4	17.52	4548 4	1	4652 3 +208ts	08 <sup>68</sup> 797 5		27, 27, 27, 27, 27, 27, 27, 27, 27, 27,	00°+
Perry	1.48	1:1	71.82	45.7	25.32	45.6	46.83	45.7	0.54	37.3	67.9	2.6	ŀ	28 O	73.5	17.71	4346 10	٤	4507 8 +3	10, 760 1		- 1	200
VA-C 92R	$0.7^{2}$	1.2	75.5	$43.3^{2}$	33.8	$43.7^{2}$	42.0	$43.0^{z}$	0.80	37.5	67.2	1,62		1.3	72.1	17.53	4505 7	0	4568 5 +1	788		21.7	+46 Fig
VA 98R	1.0	6.0	70.9	45.7	25.32	45.5	45.7	45.9	0.55	34.42	6.99	2.9		1.2	73.1	17.41	4499 8	v.	4476 9	784		790 10	112m
Wilson	6.0	$0.6^{2}$	77.3	46.6	30.1	46.6	47.5	46,6ª	0.63	32.9	64.9	2.0		1.02	26.69	16.88	4694" 1	<del></del>	4650 4	87" 795	4 791 4		i ox
Mean 1.2	1.2	1.4	78.6	45.3	37.6	45.6	41.2	44,9	1.06	40.0	67.4	2.3	1.9	1.2	72.7	17.61	4478	4425	4531 +1	+106 786	768	×0×	+37
CA (%)	27.8	35.6	5.2	2.2	17.3	2.5	12.9	2.5		9.0	2,4	30.2		56.0	1.2	2.3	8.9	<u>!</u>		7.4	2	3	}
LSD <sub>05</sub>	0.2	0.3	2.0	0.5	3.2	9.0	5.6	9.0		-8	0.8	0.3		0.3	0,4	0.20	149			52			
, P{Digging x Entry	*	+-	us	SU	us	ns	SU	4		us	SU SU	SÚ		su	us	Str	*			*			

a, z Denote means not significantly different from the greatest and least in the column, respectively, at the 5% level of probability by t-test.

ns. †, \*, \*\* Denote traits with digging-by-entry interaction that were not significant or significant at the 10%, 5%, and 1% levels of probability, respectively, by F-test.

Table 3. Disease reactions of N98002, N98003, and N00090ol compared with released cultivars.

	Early 1	leafspot				
	Defoliation	Yield	CBR	Sclerotinia	TSWV i	ncidence
Line	score	without control	incidence	incidence	All years	2000-2003
N98002	$6.60\pm0.27^{\text{de}}$	2783±250 <sup>bc</sup>	0.1244±0.1014 <sup>bcd</sup>	0.5512±0.1185 <sup>a</sup>	0.3669±0.0455bc	0.5870±0.0510 <sup>abcd</sup>
Phillips	$6.62\pm0.27^{\rm cde}$	2608±250bcd	0.1787±0.0694bed	0.5166±0.0941a	$0.3844\pm0.0457^{abc}$	0.5965±0.0511abcd
Brantley	6,61±0,34 <sup>cde</sup>	2384±319 <sup>bcde</sup>	$0.2858\pm0.1014^{abc}$	$0.3432\pm0.1629^{ab}$	$0.4167 \pm 0.0500^{ab}$	$0.6250\pm0.0510^{ab}$
NC 7	6.86±0.14 <sup>cd</sup>	2149±132 <sup>de</sup>	$0.3376\pm0.0262^{a}$	0.5665±0.0511ª	0.3463±0.0272bc	$0.6119\pm0.0468^{abc}$
NC 9	$7.10\pm0.17^{bcd}$	2219±163 <sup>cde</sup>	$0.2598 \pm 0.0275^{bc}$	$0.4776\pm0.0687^{a}$	0.4782±0.0260°	0.6512±0.0379 <sup>a</sup>
NC 10C	$7.08\pm0.17^{bcd}$	1997±163°	0.1941±0.0262°	0.4103±0.0631 <sup>a</sup>	$0.4077 \pm 0.0366^{ab}$	$0.6726\pm0.0565^{a}$
NC-V 11	7.21±0.15 <sup>bc</sup>	2327±145 <sup>cde</sup>	$0.2230\pm0.0308^{bc}$	$0.4657\pm0.0630^{a}$	0,2968±0.0247 <sup>cd</sup>	$0.5040\pm0.0327^{\mathrm{cde}}$
NC 12C	$6.24\pm0.13^{e}$	3013±117 <sup>b</sup>	0.1237±0.0275°d	0.4985±0.0584 <sup>a</sup>	0.3725±0.0257 <sup>bc</sup>	0.6099±0.0403 <sup>abc</sup>
Gregory	$6.83\pm0.14^{cd}$	2677±140 <sup>bc</sup>	0.1730±0.0293°d	$0.4772\pm0.0542^{a}$	$0.2545\pm0.0221^{d}$	0.4546±0.0282°
Perry	$6.33\pm0.19^{e}$	2602±184 <sup>bcd</sup>	$0.1100\pm0.0263^{cd}$	0.3598±0.0509a	0,3883±0.0244 <sup>b</sup>	0.6514±0.0314 <sup>a</sup>
VA-C 92R	7.60±0.14ª	2020±126e	$0.3051\pm0.0326^{ab}$	$0.3324\pm0.0689^{ab}$	$0.3146\pm0.0348^{bod}$	$0.5125\pm0.0506^{\text{bode}}$
VA 98R	$7.49\pm0.18^{ab}$	2103±174 <sup>de</sup>	0.4849±0.0563a	$0.3194\pm0.0789^{ab}$	0,2839±0,0308 <sup>ed</sup>	0.4830±0.0358 <sup>de</sup>
Wilson	6.69±0.29 <sup>cde</sup>	2358±274 <sup>cde</sup>	0.4889±0.0936a	0.6116±0.1540°	0,2839±0.0493bcd	$0.4949 \pm 0.0507^{\text{bcde}}$
GP-NC 343	$4.67\pm0.12^{f}$	3412±114 <sup>a</sup>	<del>1000</del>		~~	<b>**</b>
N96076L			$0.0262 \pm 0.0431^{d}$	$0.1341 \pm 0.0597^{b}$	***	
PI 576636	4L	***		PE PA	0.1065±0.0307°	0.2275±0.0405 <sup>f</sup>

a,b,c,d,e,f Means within a column followed by the same letter are not significantly different (P<0.05) by t-test.

LUDIC TO	Dimmenning Chai aci	teristics of extra la	a Sc noi noise		Blanch	ed	
	Moisture content	Moisture content	Blanching		Whole	Not	Partially
Line	before roasting	after roasting	loss	Splits	kernels	blanched	blanched
	***************************************			%			
N98002	6.13±0.09abc	4.16±0.11abc	2.34±0.13 <sup>ns</sup>	2.30±0.53 <sup>cd</sup>	86.89±1.14abcde	$1.86\pm0.50^{\text{cde}}$	7.03±1.40abc
Phillips	6.04±0.09bcd	4.18±0.11ab	2,29±0,13 <sup>ns</sup>	2.47±0.53abed	85.36±1.13 <sup>cde</sup>	2.75±0.50abcd	7.64±1.39°b
Brantley	$6.12 \pm 0.12^{abcd}$	$4.46\pm0.13^{a}$	2.18±0.16 <sup>ns</sup>	$2.89\pm0.67^{abcd}$	86.81±1.43 <sup>abcde</sup>	3.45±0.63 <sup>ab</sup>	5,13±1.75abc
NC 7	5,98±0,04 <sup>∞l</sup>	$4.10\pm0.05^{bcd}$	2.21±0.06 <sup>ns</sup>	$2.86 \pm 0.26^{bcd}$	84.51±0.56e	$3.71\pm0.24^{a}$	$6.61\pm0.68^{abc}$
NC 9	$6.30\pm0.05^{a}$	$4.05\pm0.05^{\text{bod}}$	2.12±0.07 <sup>ns</sup>	$2.61\pm0.26^{bcd}$	86.41±0.57 <sup>cde</sup>	$2.00\pm0.25^{de}$	$7.02\pm0.70^{abc}$
NC 10C	$6.03\pm0.04^{\text{cd}}$	$3.94\pm0.05^{\text{cef}}$	2,18±0.06 <sup>ns</sup>	$2.69\pm0.23^{bcd}$	88,56±0.48 <sup>ab</sup>	1.87±0.21 <sup>de</sup>	4.57±0.60°
NC-V 11	6.15±0.04 <sup>b</sup>	3.89±0.04ef	2.19±0.05 <sup>ns</sup>	2.61±0.22 <sup>cd</sup>	89.15±0.46 <sup>a</sup>	1.64±0.20°	4.70±0.57 <sup>bc</sup>
NC 12C	$6.00\pm0.05^{cd}$	$4.02\pm0.06^{\text{bcde}}$	2,27±0.07 <sup>ns</sup>	$2.58\pm0.30^{cd}$	87.04±0.64 <sup>bcd</sup>	$2.65\pm0.28^{bcd}$	$5.29\pm0.79^{bc}$
Gregory	$6.10\pm0.06^{bcd}$	$4.08\pm0.06^{\text{bed}}$	2.17±0.08 <sup>ns</sup>	$1.85\pm0.32^{d}$	$88.90\pm0.68^{ab}$	$2.22\pm0.30^{\text{bcde}}$	5.25±0.84 <sup>be</sup>
Perry	$5.90\pm0.07^{d}$	$4.03\pm0.08^{bcde}$	2.29±0.09 <sup>ns</sup>	$2.96\pm0.38^{abc}$	88.95±0.82ab	1.42±0.36°	$4.27\pm1.00^{\circ}$
VA-C 92F	8 6.07±0.04 <sup>bcd</sup>	$3.89\pm0.04^{ef}$	2.09±0.05 <sup>ns</sup>	3.56±0.22°	85.50±0.47 <sup>de</sup>	$2.77\pm0.21^{bc}$	$6.28\pm0.58^{abc}$
VA 98R	$5.98 \pm 0.07^{cd}$	3.82±0.08 <sup>f</sup>	2.28±0.09 <sup>ns</sup>	2.10±0.38 <sup>cd</sup>	88.85±0.82ab	1.44±0.36°	8.35±1.01°
Wilson	6.02±0.07bed	3.90±0.09def	2,28±0,10 <sup>ns</sup>	3.56±0.42ab	88,06±0,91 <sup>abc</sup>	1.31±0.40°	5.05±1.12bc

a,b,c,d,e,f,g,h Means within a column followed by the same letter are not significantly different (P<0.05) by t-test.

No significant differences among means line effects by F-test (P>0.05).

Table 5.	Blanching charact	teristics of mediun	n kernels.		······································		
					Blane	ched	NI-TWIF-18-45-4
	Moisture content	Moisture content	Blanching		Whole	Not	Partially
Line	before roasting	after roasting	loss	Splits	kernels	blanched	blanched
				%			
N98002	$6.18\pm0.09^{abc}$	$3.84\pm0.09^{cd}$	1.96±0.20 <sup>b</sup>	4.12±0.74 <sup>abc</sup>	66.92±2.28e	15.20±1.63 <sup>a</sup>	11.91±1.35a
<b>Phillips</b>	$6.27\pm0.09^{abc}$	4.12±0.09°	$2.17\pm0.19^{ab}$	3.86±0.73bc	$71.74\pm2.27^{de}$	11.08±1.61 <sup>ab</sup>	11.30±1,34ab
Brantley	$6.14\pm0.11^{abc}$	$4.17\pm0.11^{a}$	$2.19\pm0.25^{ab}$	2.81±0.92°	$68.73 \pm 2.86^{de}$	$15.75\pm2.04^{a}$	10,69±1,69 <sup>abc</sup>
NC 7	$6.25\pm0.04^{abc}$	$4.16\pm0.04^{a}$	$2.19\pm0.10^{ab}$	$3.88\pm0.36^{bc}$	68.74±1.11°	13.43±0.79 <sup>a</sup>	11.90±0.66a
NC 9	$6.33\pm0.04^{\circ}$	$4.16\pm0.04^{a}$	$2.39\pm0.10^{ab}$	$3.81\pm0.37^{bo}$	77.65±1.14 <sup>bo</sup>	$5.35\pm0.81^{d}$	10.93±0.67 <sup>ab</sup>
NC 10C	$6.17\pm0.04^{\circ}$	$3.97\pm0.04^{abcd}$	$2.34\pm0.08^{ab}$	5.48±0.31"	81,16±0,97 <sup>a</sup>	4.37±0.69 <sup>d</sup>	$6.79\pm0.57^{4}$
NC-V 11	6,29±0,04 <sup>ab</sup>	$4.01\pm0.04^{abc}$	$2.40\pm0.08^{a}$	4.12±0.30bc	81.60±0.93°	4.86±0.66d	$7.17\pm0.55^{d}$
NC 12C	$6.17 \pm 0.05^{bc}$	$4.04\pm0.05^{ab}$	$2.20\pm0.11^{ab}$	3.39±0.42°	73.13±1.29 <sup>d</sup>	$10.82 \pm 0.92^{\mathrm{b}}$	10.62±0.76 <sup>abc</sup>
Gregory	$6.23 \pm 0.05^{abc}$	$4.06\pm0.05^{ab}$	$2.38\pm0.12^{ab}$	3.78±0.44 <sup>bc</sup>	$73.42 \pm 1.37^{cd}$	$9.58\pm0.98^{b}$	$11.01\pm0.81^{ab}$
Perry	6.14±0.06°	4.07±0.06 <sup>a</sup>	$2.42\pm0.14^{a}$	$4.97\pm0.53^{ab}$	$78.87 \pm 1.63^{ab}$	$5.82 \pm 1.16^{d}$	$8.06\pm0.97^{cd}$
VA-C 92R		$3.99\pm0.04^{abc}$	$2.30\pm0.08^{ab}$	$4.34\pm0.30^{bc}$	$73.38\pm0.94^{d}$	$9.23\pm0.67^{bc}$	10.89±0.56 <sup>ab</sup>
VA 98R	$6.20\pm0.06^{abc}$	$3.84\pm0.06^{d}$	2,20±0,14 <sup>ab</sup>	4.57±0.53abc	82.30±1.64a	4.32±1.17 <sup>d</sup>	$6.76\pm0.97^{d}$
Wilson	6.16±0.07abc	3.89±0.07 <sup>bcd</sup>	2.17±0.16 <sup>ab</sup>	5.03±0.59ab	77.71±1.82abc	6.48±1.30 <sup>cd</sup>	8.75±1.08bcd

a,b,c,d,e Means within a column followed by the same letter are not significantly different (P<0.05) by t-test.

Table 6. Sensory data collected by the USDA-ARS Market Quality and Handling Research Unit, Raleigh, NC, from samples collected from the Virginia-Carolina peanut production area.

Line	Roasted peanut <sup>§†</sup>	Sweet	Bitter	Astringent
	<u></u> j	flavor intensity units	(fiu) on a 1 to 14 scai	le
Phillips	3.35±0.24 <sup>bc</sup>	3.36±0.27ab	2.37±0.19ab	2.68±0.18 <sup>b</sup>
Brantley	$3.35\pm0.13^{\circ}$	$3.02\pm0.14^{b}$	$2.68\pm0.10^{a}$	$3.18\pm0.10^{a}$
NC 7	3.52±0.12bc	2.74±0.12 <sup>b</sup>	$2.68\pm0.09^{a}$	2.99±0.08ab
Gregory	$4.19\pm0.28^{a}$	2,60±0,29 <sup>b</sup>	$2.47 \pm 0.20^{ab}$	2,93±0,20 <sup>ab</sup>
Florunner	$3.80\pm0.11^{ab}$	$2.75\pm0.12^{ab}$	2.66±0.08 <sup>a</sup>	3.17±0.08 <sup>a</sup>
Georgia Green	3.81±0.13 <sup>ab</sup>	$3.41\pm0.14^{a}$	$2.34\pm0.10^{b}$	$3.12\pm0.10^{ab}$

a,b,c Means in the same column followed by the same letter are not significantly different (P<0.05) by t-test.

Table 7. Sensory data collected by the USDA-ARS Market Quality and Handling Research Unit, Raleigh, NC, from samples collected from the 2003 Uniform Peanut Performance Test at nine locations.

Line	Roasted peanut <sup>§†</sup>	Sweet	Sweet aromatic	Bitter	Astrin- gent	Dark roast	Raw beany	Woody	Card- board	Fruity <sup>‡</sup>
	flavor intensity units (fiu) on a 1 to 14 scale									
Phillips	4.56ab	2.08 <sup>b</sup>	2.95 <sup>b</sup>	3,06ª	1.12 <sup>ns</sup>	2.99 <sup>ns</sup>	2.25 <sup>ns</sup>	3.11 <sup>a</sup>	1.40 <sup>ab</sup>	1.19 <sup>ab</sup>
Brantley	$4.38^{\rm b}$	$2.01^{\rm b}$	$2.84^{b}$	$3.10^{a}$	1.10 <sup>ns</sup>	2.76 <sup>ns</sup>	2.39 <sup>ns</sup>	3.13 <sup>a</sup>	1.65 <sup>a</sup>	1.49ab
NC 7	4.58 <sup>ab</sup>	$2.03^{b}$	2.84 <sup>b</sup>	$3.03^{ab}$	1.05 <sup>ns</sup>	2.70 <sup>ns</sup>	2.36 <sup>ns</sup>	3.13 <sup>a</sup>	1.40°	$1.04^{b}$
Florunner	4.78ª	2.29 <sup>a</sup>	3.09 <sup>a</sup>	2.91 <sup>b</sup>	1.07 <sup>ns</sup>	$2.91^{\mathrm{ns}}$	$2.21^{ns}$	$3.04^{b}$	1.13 <sup>b</sup>	1.62 <sup>a</sup>

Graded samples from Suffolk, VA; Lewiston, NC; Tifton, GA; Headland, AL; Marianna, FL; Stephenville, TX; Denver City, TX; Pearsall, TX; and Fort Cobb, OK tasted.

Graded samples from Lewiston, NC; Headland, AL; Stephenville, TX; Pearsall, TX; and Fort Cobb, OK tasted. a,b Means in the same column followed by the same letter are not significantly different (P<0.05) by t-test.

Table 8. Fatty acid composition, iodine values, oleic-linoleic ratios, polysaturated-saturated ratios, and calcium content of seeds grown in the Peanunt variety and Quality Evaluation. Adjusted means from analysis of all data on the indicated lines collected since 1986.

				Fatty ac	Fatty acid contents					Ofeic-to		Dofer	2 2 1	
Line	Palmitic (16:0)	Stearic (18:0)	Oleic (18:1)	Linoleic (18:2)	Arachidic (20:0)	Eicosenoic (20:1)	Behenic (22:0)	Lignoceric (24:0)	Iodine value <sup>†</sup>	linoleic	Total saturates <sup>‡</sup>	rory- unsaturate-to- saturate ratio <sup>§</sup>	chain	Calcium
				%	- % of total fatty acids	S,			%		%		%	щаа
N98002	9.73±0.07 <sup>cd</sup>	$2.52\pm0.06^{8}$	$48.21\pm0.32^{fg}$	$32.37\pm0.30^{b}$	$1.31\pm0.02^{f8}$	$1.35\pm0.03^{a}$	2.97±0.05 <sup>n</sup>	1.54±0.03	98.59±0,27bc	1.40±0.28 <sup>cd</sup>	18.07±0.10bc	$1.80\pm0.02^{5c}$	5.82±0.098b	649+31°de
<b>Phillips</b>	9.67±0.07 <sup>cd</sup>	$2.48\pm0.06^{8}$	$48.80\pm0.30^{\circ}$	$32.03\pm0.28^{bc}$	$1.29\pm0.02^{8}$	$1,32\pm0.03^{8}$	$2.94\pm0.05^{20}$	1,49±0.03	98.48±0.26bc	1.58±0.27cd	17.86±0.09 <sup>cd</sup>	1.79±0.02 <sup>bc</sup>	5.72±0.08ªbc	672±31 <sup>bod</sup>
Brantley	5.73±0.09 <sup>®</sup>	$4.15\pm0.08^{\text{n}}$	$79.14\pm0.39^{3}$	4.37±0.36	$1.69\pm0.03^{a}$	$1,35\pm0.03^{8}$	$2.49\pm0.06^{\mathrm{f}}$	$1.10\pm0.04^{\ell}$	76.68±0.33	21.75±0.34	15.16±0,118		5.28±0.10de	667±39bcde
NC 7	$8.76\pm0.04^{t}$	3.67±0.03°	$55.89\pm0.16^{\text{b}}$	$25.11\pm0.15^{\text{h}}$	$1.63\pm0.01^{b}$	1.05±0.01°	$2.77\pm0.03^{cd}$	$1.15\pm0.02^{t}$	$92.36\pm0.13^{h}$	$2.30\pm0.14^{b}$	17.99±0.05bc		5.56±0.04°	658±17°de
NC 9	10.13±0.06°	$2.71\pm0.05^{f}$	47.07±0.24 <sup>h</sup>	$33.31\pm0.22^{a}$	$1.33\pm0.02^{fg}$	$1.22\pm0.02^{b}$	$2.82\pm0.04^{bcd}$	$1.51\pm0.03^{a}$	99.06±0.20 <sup>2b</sup>	1.41±0.21 <sup>cd</sup>	18,49±0,07°		5.66±0.06 <sup>be</sup>	565±35°f
NC 10C	9.77±0.04€	$3.16\pm0.03^{\circ}$	$48.80\pm0.16^{t}$	31.68±0.15	$1.48\pm0.01^{cd}$	$1.04\pm0.01^{c}$	$2.77\pm0.03^{cd}$	$1.30\pm0.02^{d}$	$97.65\pm0.14^{d}$	1.54±0.14 <sup>cd</sup>	18.49±0,05ª		5.55±0.04	653±18 <sup>cde</sup>
NC-V 11	10.36±0.04°	2.39±0.038	47.60±0.17gh	33.13±0.16	$1.19\pm0.01^{\rm h}$	$1.23\pm0.01^{b}$	2.58±0,03	1.49±0.02	99.32±0.14ª	$1.40\pm0.15^{d}$	18.02±0.05 <sup>bc</sup>		5.26+0.04de	647±20cde
NC 12C	9.65±0.05 <sup>cd</sup>	3.07±0.04 <sup>cd</sup>	$51.61\pm0.20^{d}$	29,27±0,19€	$1.46\pm0.01^{de}$	1,05±0.02°	2.67±0.03€	$1.22\pm0.02^{\circ}$	95.90±0.17 <sup>t</sup>	1.80±0.18 <sup>cd</sup>	18.08±0.06 <sup>b</sup>		5.36±0.05 <sup>d</sup>	576±20 <sup>f</sup>
Gregory	8.94±0.05	2.95±0.05	52.94±0.23°	$28.36\pm0.21^{f}$	1.43±0.02°	$1.25\pm0.02^{b}$	2.74±0.04de	$1.41\pm0.02^{bc}$	95.63±0.19 <sup>f</sup>	$1.82\pm0.20^{bcd}$	$17.46\pm0.07^{f}$		5.58±0.06°	638±23cde
Perry	9.72±0.05 <sup>cd</sup>	$2.62\pm0.05^{I}$	$48.72\pm0.24^{\circ}$	$32.04\pm0.22^{bc}$	$1.36\pm0.02^{f}$	$1.23\pm0.02^{b}$	$2.85\pm0.04^{abc}$	$1.48\pm0.02^{a}$	98.36±0.20°	$1.46\pm0.21^{cd}$	18.02±0,07bc		5.69±0.06 <sup>bc</sup>	682±23bc
VA-C 92R	9.60±0.04	$3.06\pm0.03^{d}$	49.97±0,16°	$30.31\pm0.15^{d}$	1.51±0.01°	$1.20\pm0.01^{b}$	2.96±0.03 <sup>a</sup>	$1.41\pm0.02^{bc}$	96.41±0.14°	1,66±0.14 <sup>cd</sup>	18.54±0.05°		5.87±0.04ª	868±18°
VA 98R	$10.15\pm0.05^{b}$	$2.45\pm0.05^{8}$	$48.54\pm0.24^{f}$	$32.48\pm0.22^{b}$	$1.20\pm0.02^{h}$	$1.21\pm0.02^{b}$	$2.53\pm0.04^{f}$	$1.47\pm0.03^{80}$	$98.95\pm0.20^{20}$	$1.42\pm0.21^{ed}$	17.78±0.07 <sup>de</sup>	1.83±0.01 <sup>ab</sup>	5.19±0.06	617±23def
Wilson	8.80±0.06 <sup>et</sup>	3.12±0.05 <sup>cd</sup>	53.49±0.26°	27.68±0.248	$1.48\pm0.02^{cd}$	$1.23\pm0.02^{b}$	$2.82\pm0.04^{cd}$	1.39±0.03°	$94.91\pm0.22^{8}$	$2.01\pm0.23^{bc}$	17.61±0.08 <sup>ef</sup>	$1.58\pm0.02^{f}$	5.70±0.07bc	745±26°
a,b,c,d,e,f,g	h Means within	un a column f	ollowed by the	,b,c,d,e,f,g,h Means within a column followed by the same letter are not significantly	tot significantly	y different (P<0.05) by t-test	.05) by t-test.							

No significant differences among means line effects by F-test (P>0.05).
Weighted sum of oleic, linoleic, and eicosenoic acid contemts [0.8601(18:1)+1.7321(18:2)+0.7854(20:1)]
Sum of palmitic, stearic, arachidic, behenic, and lignoceric acid contents.
Ratio of linoleic acid content to total saturated fatty acid content.
Sum of arachidic, behenic, and lignoceric acid contents.

REPRODUCE EOCALLY, include form number and edition date on all reproductions.  FORM APPROVED - OMB NO. 0581-0055							
U.S. DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE AGRICULTURAL MARKETING SERVICE  EXHIBIT E	Application is required in order to determine if a plant variety protection certificate is to be issued (7 U.S.C. 2421). The information is held confidential until the certificate is issued (7 U.S.C. 2426).						
STATEMENT OF THE BASIS OF OWNERSHIP							
1. NAME OF APPLICANT(S)  North Carolina State University	2. TEMPORARY DESIGNATION OR EXPERIMENTAL NUMBER N98003	3. VARIETY NAME Phillips					
U.S. Government as represented by the Secretary of Agriculture							
4. ADDRESS (Street and No., or R.F.D. No., City, State, and ZIP, and Country)  5. TELEPHONE (Include area code)  6. FAX (Include area code)							
Office of Technology Transfer, Box 8210		(919) 515-3773					
N.C. State University, Raleigh, NC 27695-8210	7. PVPO NUMBER						
USA	20060070						
8. Does the applicant own all rights to the variety? Mark an "X" in the appropriate block. If no, please explain.  X YES NO							
9. Is the applicant (individual or company) a U.S. national or a U.S. based company? <b>if no, give name of country.</b> X YES NO							
10. Is the applicant the original owner? X YES NO If no, please answer one of the following:							
a. If the original rights to variety were owned by individual(s), is (are) the original owner(s) a U.S. National(s)?							
YES NO If no, give name of country							
b. If the original rights to variety were owned by a company(ies), is (are) the original owner(s) a U.S. based company?							
YES NO If no, give name of country							
11. Additional explanation on ownership (Trace ownership from original breeder to current owner. Use the reverse for extra space if needed):							
This variety was jointly developed and is co-owned by North Carolina State University and the U.S. Government as represented by the U.S. Secretary of Agriculture.							
PLEASE NOTE:							
	naa) uuha maat tha fallansina aritari						
Plant variety protection can only be afforded to the owners (not licensees) who meet the following criteria:							
<ol> <li>If the rights to the variety are owned by the original breeder, that person must be a U.S. national, national of a UPOV member country, or national of a country which affords similar protection to nationals of the U.S. for the same genus and species.</li> </ol>							
2. If the rights to the variety are owned by the company which employed the original breeder(s), the company must be U.S. based, owned by nationals of a UPOV member country, or owned by nationals of a country which affords similar protection to nationals of the U.S. for the same genus and species.							
3. If the applicant is an owner who is not the original owner, both the original owner and the applicant must meet one of the above criteria.							
The original breeder/owner may be the individual or company who dire Act for definitions.	ected the final breeding. See Section 41(	a)(2) of the Plant Variety Protection					
According to the Paperwork Reduction Act of 1995, an agency may not conduct or sponsor, a control number. The valid OMB control number for this information collection is 0581-0055. The including the time for reviewing the instructions, searching existing data sources, gathering and the instructions.	he time required to complete this information collection	is estimated to average 0.1 hour per response,					
The U.S. Department of Agriculture (USDA) prohibits discrimination in all its programs and activities on the basis of race, color, national origin, gender, religion, age, disability, sexual orientation, mental or family status, political beliefs, parental status, or protected genetic information. (Not all prohibited bases apply to all programs.) Persons with disabilities who require afternative means for communication of program information (Braille, large print, audiotape, etc.) should contact USDA's TARGET Center at 202-720-2600 (voice and TDD).							

To file a complaint of discrimination, write USDA, Director, Office of Civil Rights, Room 326-W, Whitten Building, 14th and Independence Avenue, SW, Washington, D.C. 20250-9410 or call (202) 720-5964 (voice and TDD). USDA is an equal opportunity provide and employer.